REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 15, 2009. Claims 118 to 121, 124 to 133 and 136 to 142 are in the application. Claims 118, 130 and 142 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 118 to 121, 124 to 133 and 136 to 142 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,732,277 (Kodosky) in view of http://www.uiml.org/ (UIML), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,968,539 (Huang) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,481,741 (McKaskle). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Referring to the claim language, Claim 118 is directed to a data processing apparatus comprising a library for storing a plurality of filters and a processor for processing a computer program stored on a computer-readable storage medium. The processor executes, by processing the computer program, a selecting step, a modifying step, and a generating step. The selecting step selects and loads a plurality of desired filters from the library based on a first user instruction in order to form an application, wherein the plurality of selected desired filters are arranged in a sequence based on the first user instruction. The plurality of selected desired filters are used for filtering a data object based on the sequence. The modifying step modifies a user interface description object, written in a markup language, to add codes of user interface components corresponding to the selected desired filters arranged in the sequence. The generating step generates display data for displaying the user interface components corresponding to the plurality of selected desired filters in a display apparatus, by parsing the user interface description object modified in the modifying step, wherein a user inputs data to the plurality of selected

desired filters via the user interface components. A user interface component corresponding to a filter further selected based on a second user instruction from the plurality of desired filters selected in the selecting step may be selectively hidden.

Independent Claims 130 and 142 are directed to a method and a computer-readable medium, respectively, that substantially correspond to the apparatus of Claim 118.

The applied art, either alone or in combination, is not seen to disclose or suggest selectively hiding a user interface component corresponding to a filter further selected based on a second user instruction from a plurality of selected desired filters, wherein the desired filters are selected and loaded from a library based on a first user instruction in order to form an application, are arranged in a sequence based on the first user instruction, and are used for filtering a data object based on the sequence.

The Office Action alleges that McKaskle teaches selectively hiding part of a user interface that corresponds to a filter in Column 5, lines 31 to 34. The cited portion of McKaskle is seen to teach the programing of a block diagram to automatically hide certain controls or indicators when they are not in use. However, as pointed out by Applicants' Amendment dated January 21, 2009, the selected desired filters of the present claims are "used for filtering a data object". Once the selected desired filters have been selected based on a first user instruction, a selected desired filter is further selected based on a second user instruction, and a user interface component corresponding to the further-selected filter is selectively hidden. Thus, unlike McKaskle, although a user interface component of a filter may be selectively hidden, the filter itself is still "used for filtering a data object".

Indeed, the Office Action on page 4 concedes that "McKaskle does not explicitly disclose hiding controls or indicators when they are in use". Nonetheless, the

Office Action contends that "it is well known in the art for many years that users may, for example, selectively hide part of the UI while the application is running or, moreover, selectively hide part of the UI such as the part that corresponds to a filter". The Office Action, however, fails to provide any documentary evidence to support this contention and therefore, the rejections are traversed.

Applicants submit that the allegedly well known prior art would not have been well known because selectively hiding a user interface component corresponding to a filter used for filtering a data object would have been counterintuitive in the context of the claims. As recited in the claims, a plurality of desired filters are selected and loaded based on a first user instruction in order to form an application. The plurality of selected desired filters are arranged in a sequence based on the first user instruction. Display data is generated for displaying user interface components corresponding to the plurality of selected desired filters in a display apparatus. Applicants submit that it is counterintuitive to selectively hide a user interface component corresponding to a filter after having selected, loaded and arranged the filter. Accordingly, it is believed that selectively hiding a user interface component corresponding to a filter as recited in the claims would not have been well known.

As a formal matter, Applicants note that the present application is under final rejection, and that MPEP § 2144.03 provides that the circumstances where official notice may be relied on "should be rare when an application is under final rejection or action under 37 CFR 1.113".

MPEP § 2144.03 also states:

> "Official notice unsupported by documentary evidence should only be taken by the examiner where the facts asserted to be well-known, or to be common knowledge in the art are capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known. As noted by the court in In re Ahlert, 424 F.2d 1088, 1091, 165 USPQ 418, 420 (CCPA 1970), the notice of facts beyond the record which may be taken by the examiner must be 'capable of such instant and unquestionable demonstration as to defy dispute' (citing In re Knapp Monarch Co., 296 F.2d 230, 132 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1961))."

Applicants submit that the Office Action's assertion of well known prior art is not capable of such instant and unquestionable demonstration as to defy dispute. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to provide documentary evidence in support of the assertion of well known prior art as required by MPEP § 2144.03.

Even if the Office Action's assertion were true, which Applicants do not concede to be the case, it would not have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to selectively hide the controls and indicators of McKaskle while they are in use as hypothesized by the Office Action. McKaskle is seen to primarily concern virtual instrumentation. The whole purpose of such instrumentation is to display an indication or measurement. Thus, hiding the indicators and controls of McKaskle while they are in use seems contrary to the teachings of McKaskle. As a consequence, such a modification of McKaskle would not have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art.

In view of the foregoing, McKaskle or any of the other references applied in the Office Action are not seen to disclose or suggest selectively hiding a user interface component corresponding to a filter further selected based on a second user instruction from a plurality of selected desired filters, wherein the desired filters are selected and loaded from a library based on a first user instruction in order to form an application, are

arranged in a sequence based on the first user instruction, and are used for filtering a data object based on the sequence. Allowance of the claims is therefore respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicants
Michael K. O'Neill
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 3741357v1